Farmer-Chef Marketing Alliances

Elements of a Workable Business Plan

Based on experiences of a 2001 Northern Colorado farmer-chef marketing alliance funded by the USDA Federal-State Marketing Improvement Program with support from the Colorado Department of Agriculture-Markets Division and Colorado State University. Carol Beaver, Michael Smalldone, Wendy White, Jennifer Grannis, Sue Oberle, Geri McGibney, Sheron Buchele and Paul Bula u from the Fort Collins BAMCO operations also provided valuable input to this project and report.

Dawn Thilmany
Associate Professor and Extension Economist
Colorado State University
B313 Clark
Fort Collins CO 80523-1172
970-491-7220
thilmany@lamar.colostate.edu

Executive Summary

Mission Statement: To increase direct market opportunities for local producers of fruits, vegetables, herbs, artisinal produce and lightly processed foods by improving the accessibility to local chefs that prefer to use local products through informational and coordination efforts. This plan assumes that some market intermediation may be necessary to increase the volume of sales between producers and chefs.

Between May and October of 2001, the Fort Collins Agricultural Marketing Cooperative filled almost $9000 in orders to chefs. These orders were shared among 19 producers, six of which made $500 or more in sales. A total of nine chefs/restaurants ordered from FCAMC during the season, and six of these chefs made regular, weekly orders. In addition to direct sales, a direct marketing account was developed with Bon Apetit Management Company at the Fort Collins Hewlett Packard site (the first customer of the marketing project). BAMCO's sales volume and joint effort to establish a greens market at their site allowed them to establish a direct marketing connection with producers. For the season, they made $15,000 in direct purchases from producers (outside the FCAMC).

The FCAMC business plan has been organized to allow both restaurants and producers to benefit from the program. Interested parties are asked to evaluate the program based on what it can offer their business, whether it is the opportunity to market a restaurant as supporting local agriculture, or for the producer, a venue to see your produce on the table at local restaurants in order to increase the visibility of local agriculture or your operation. FCAMC is organized as a not-for-profit pilot project, but the organization was carefully structured to allow for long-term operation if market demand and supply conditions allow. The core principles outlined in this business plan were only fully implemented in the Fort Collins market, as chefs in the Boulder and Denver region were more interested in different forms of market intermediation. These cases will be discussed briefly throughout.

In each section of the business plan, more generalized recommendations will be provided for those interested in doing such a marketing enterprise in their own area.

The Business and its Service

Farmer-chef marketing alliances match and coordinate local producers and chefs interested in direct food links. Although there are a few established businesses of this type in the US (Red Tomato, Home Grown Wisconsin), localized restaurant marketing is in its initial stages of development in the US. The alliances can take many forms but this plan offers suggestions of what marketing, finance and organizational issues may lend to the highest likelihood of success.

A sample product list and invoice is attached to show the nature of the alliance's business. Both staple crops (tomatoes, onions) and specialty produce (mushrooms, herbs and baby vegetables) were strong sellers in Fort Collins and Boulder.

The contribution of any good farmer-chef alliance will be to provide the information and coordination services to producers and chefs that want to do business with one another, so in essence, it is a service rather than a producer of a good. This is similar to more traditional distributors, but such alliances generally connect smaller suppliers and food users and add more value (better quality, freshness, social capital and benefits to those involved). This type of localized, producer-driven distribution system it in its introductory and growth stage in Colorado, as well as throughout the country. The only enterprise in this field that is approaching maturity is Red Tomato, but it has still struggled to finance its operations purely through market revenues (it requires external, philanthropic support).

Although there has been some initial success in Colorado, it is clear that each side of the farmer-chef market equation needs to invest extra time and resources to "grow" the business. In a broader sense, a measure of those extra costs and benefits must be done at an individual business level, and be a unique decision for any producer or chef considering this type of market strategy.

The Market

- ✓ *Start early to get producer commitments and establish a list of produce and prices*
- ✓ *Start marketing in early spring. Although the variety of produce is smaller, it will allow you to work out the logistics of ordering, delivery and payments when volume is low.*
- ✓ *Approach chefs personally. Mail and the Web are not good communication tools for the restaurant industry yet. An initial call should be followed with a visit (bringing free samples is very popular!) and regular phone calls or faxes.*

The market for farmer-chef alliances can be defined as any chef that considers their food inputs as a differentiable part of their own marketing strategy, thereby allowing them to accept prices and volumes at noncommodity levels and producers that are willing to market their products to meet such demands. Chefs can operate food institutions of any size, but generally value some attribute of food inputs (freshness, uniqueness, locally produced, natural) highly enough to make them less price sensitive. Producers can also be of any size or enterprise, but must be willing to adapt their production, post-harvest and marketing strategies to fit the needs of chef clientele. Market research on the potential market share of these chefs (and cooperating producers) is not available, but a review of past projects in other states, and personal experience, would suggest that about 5% of chefs will have interest in pursuing this concept.

Growing the market must be done carefully. There is a temptation to increase the number of chefs you work with, but you must also be careful to make sure each chef gets the diversity and volume of produce they demand. So, look for restaurants that may want a different mix of products (as evidenced by their menus) or that match the supplies available from your producers.

To cover the costs of the Colorado distribution system, approximately $1000-1500 in sales per week is needed. This sales goal is likely to be most attainable in market areas with populations of $100-$250,000. One might also argue that any area that can support a farmer's market, should also have a large enough population based to support this type of marketing. In larger markets, a more sophisticated distribution system may be needed (due to a more diverse business culture), but additional costs of storage facilities and vehicles can be offset by higher potential sales. In smaller markets, it is likely that the small number of interested chefs may be best served by direct sales with one or two producers, and it may be easier for these businesses to connect because of the locally-oriented social culture. Finally, it is possible for producers to sell outside of their traditional regional markets if sales potential is attractive enough. This was the case for Wisconsin, which entered the Chicago market to attract more sales, but it requires a significantly larger investment than the business outlined here ($100-$250,000 in start-up funds).

Competition

We compete directly with traditional produce distributors. These alliances are unique because of the variety of produce offered, guarantee of harvest within 24-hours of delivery, quality of produce, and direct link with local agriculture (an attribute important to some chefs). This market position may become even more attractive in the future if concerns about food source, and subsequent safety of food inputs, continue to escalate.

The most positive thing about our competition, is that most alliances should be open to allying with more traditional distributors if the opportunity arises. Most producers have developed chef alliances because of a perceived need to increase market opportunities since distributors have increasingly moved away from sourcing product with smaller, local producers. There is some potential for farmer-chef alliances to be successful in showing the market demand for smaller lot, unique, local produce so that distributors have incentives to carry more of those lines in the future.

Risk/Opportunity

The challenges and issues faced by the Northern Colorado farmer-chef operations are no different than those noted by other regions that have initiated similar operations (see literature review). However, there is starting to be sufficient marketing and operational information from a number of projects that it allows us to infer some marketing and policy implications.

First, there is demand for farmer-chef distribution among a small, but significant number of chefs who support the concept of local food systems but are currently unable or unwilling to make extra efforts to secure local products. It does not appear that the margins to be made from a farmer-chef distribution system are enough to fuel entrepreneurial efforts, but with some seed monies to support the first years of development, such operations may be feasible.

Second, the labor and management needed to run such an operation are substantial, and it may be difficult to find the right person (people) to get the operation up and running since there are some challenging dynamics to coordinating both producers and chefs.

Thus, it may be worthwhile for government or nonprofit agencies to consider seed grants to establish these farmer chef programs, providing a base salary for individuals interested in coordinating the distribution of produce for the first 1-3 years until the operation has grown enough to fund itself. Even if the seed money does not lead to a long-term operation being established, it will at least contribute to greater market access and awareness between the chefs and producers, thus establishing a larger set of direct sales within the local food system.

The Company and Personnel

In Fort Collins, a director was in charge of establishing producer and chef relationships, developing and distributing product/price lists, calling chefs to secure orders, coordinating these order with producers (through pre-orders rather than simply shopping market), invoicing, accounting and delivery. This was intended to make the system as easy to use as possible for the chefs and producers, but required more phone calls than was expected. This process may need to be streamlined in the future as the market matures.

In Boulder, Carol Beaver felt she had a good idea about the chef's preferences. Since most interested establishments were close to the marketplace, she offered an inexpensive option that would simply take care of calls, coordination and invoicing, but not provide delivery (at a flat rate of $10). Yet, delivery could be added for a 10% charge. Carol did a nice job of promoting the produce available by sending descriptive product lists to chefs each week (see attachment). All marketing and distribution efforts were managed independently by Carol Beaver of Beaver Farms Foraging, and her assistant, Michael Smalldone, with little involvement from the producers. Over the course of the summer, 3 restaurants made orders from Boulder's market producers, and produce was purchased consistently from 10 producers. An average of $150-175 a week was delivered to these chefs between early June and mid-September, with total sales approaching $3000. In Denver, the market is large and the number of restaurants is great. Since coordination at that level seemed overwhelming at this point in the project's life cycle, little was done to address the metro market.

As the three different approaches demonstrate, farmer-chef marketing alliances can follow several different organizational strategies to succeed. The most prevalent organizational choice for other producers who have come together to market jointly is a cooperative. Through investments of capital, managerial expertise or storage facilities and vehicles, producers can use their joint capacity to market more effectively. However, this approach also has challenges in that producers' objectives and preferred modes of operation may differ significantly. Another approach is for an independent person or business (that may be a producer or producer employee) to run the business in alliance with producers, but treat them as crucial supply resources for the marketing enterprise. This would be akin to Carol Beaver's efforts in Boulder. The one challenge with this approach is that potential financial gains are insufficient for any individual or business to bear the risk of entering this new market enterprise. Finally, a producer may choose to just directly market to chefs (as happened with BAMCO and in Denver), without pooling resources with others. The major setback with this approach is that few producers grow the volume or variety of produce that chefs are interested in procuring, and for some reason, few producers have had success in independent ventures. The other possible solution is for a motivated producer to invest the marketing resources to direct market, but augment their produce lines with product available from others they know through other organizations (farmer's markets, cooperatives, local organizations).

In short, there are several potential ways to organize, all of which have pros and cons. So, it is the challenge of the producers to determine which approach may work best in their market. Evidence suggests some cooperation and alliance is needed to develop a substantial customer base to assure the volume, diversity and consistent supply of volume that chefs require.

If a cooperative venture is undertaken, the following recommendations for staffing should be considered based on the Fort Collins pilot project.

- ✓ *Staffing this business may be tricky. Given previous experiences one of the following strategies may be appropriate:*
    - *Find a producer who is interested in the restaurant market and pitch this concept as a way for them to grow, beyond the supplies and diversity of their own operation. The labor costs will supplement the sales they make, and the extra product lines will make them a more attractive supplier to the chef*
    - *Try to secure an intern with horticulture and agribusiness background that can receive credit as well as be paid from the project's operating margins. In this case, it is likely that some advisor/leader would be needed to direct their efforts.*
    - *If a farmer's market manager feels underemployed, see if they are willing to organize the distribution, as they already have contact with producers regularly. Although deliveries may be difficult for them to carry out (time conflict of needing to be at market), a delivery person could be hired for the hours necessary to complete deliveries.*

Although some cooperative management and marketing efforts by all the participating chefs and producers are necessary for effective operations, an alliance manager appears to be necessary for a successful enterprise.

Strategic Alliances

Whatever organizational strategy a producer decides on, it is important to have some specific strategic alliances that will create more effective networks for intial market development. For this project, the Colorado Department of Agriculture, Colorade State University, the Colorado Chef's Collaborative, ACF Culinarians of Colorado and Colorado Proud were all important players in spreading the word about local marketing efforts. Land grant institutions and state departments of agriculture all have resources (educational and human) available to consult and advise with producers on business development issues. Various chef organizations are generally populated with the type of chefs who are most interested in buying local, quality produce with some special attributes, so belonging and visiting their meetings can be a very effective market development tool. Finally, almost every state or region has a program that promotes and networks those interested in local agriculture, like Colorado Proud. Tapping into that resource can be a very efficient way to get word out about your marketing alliance and secure suppliers and buyers.

Financial and Capital Requirements

In its first year, FCAMC was funded by a USDA-FSMIP grant. Because of this, many upfront and operational costs are not being passed on either to producers or restaurants. However, for this program to operate in the future, this project realized that a sustainable business framework was necessary. It should be noted that this is expected to be a not-for-profit enterprise, so cash flow budgeting is more important than an income or balance sheet approach to controlling finances. Thus, most of the discussion will focus on covering variable/controllable costs, rather than investments and returns to investments.

Each restaurant is charged a premium-wholesale price for produce that is delivered. Producers receive 85% of the price paid by restaurants (Restaurant Price = $1.50; Farmer's Receive: $1.30) . It was estimated that a 15% margin was needed to cover operational costs. The accumulated revenues from the 2001 season will be carried over as the start-up budget for the 2002 season. (In a review of similar projects in other states, it is more likely that a 3-4 year, subsidized start up period will be necessary).

Overall, our goal was to secure $1200 in sales per week, as this would translate to $180 in retained earnings (the 15% margin) to pay the distributor position (15 hours a week at $10 an hour) and cover their direct costs (phone & mileage). For the short-term future, grants will be written to secure the capital, overhead and market research costs of the project. Given research on other projects of similar nature, this type of financing is necessary until the farmer-chef alliance is fully developed and at a mature stage.

For Boulder, Carol Beaver decided to offer restaurants 2 levels of service. She charges $10 to facilitate pre-orders (basically calling and securing product that the restaurants pick up themselves) with an additional 10% charge for delivery. She found this to be more sustainable in Boulder since many chefs expressed an interest in sending their staffs to pick up product, but wanted assurances that all desired product would be available.

Carol believes this approach is sustainable since there is only an operational cost if orders exist, and those costs are minimal if the revenue for the operation is minimal. Moreover, no capital costs are needed except the grant monies used to "grow" the market.

In Fort Collins, we tried a more structured approach. Currently, farmer participants are asked to contribute $50.00 to join the program. This fee was refunded in 2001, but was collected to serve two purposes: to signal accountability among producers for the program with a small investment (thereby allowing the marketing manager to focus their attention on specific producers and product); and, as a capital base in case the operation needs cash on hand to cover expenses and costs if accounts receivable are not readily paid (to increase liquidity).

A more capitalized distribution approach would require either a larger operating margin or necessitate that producers put in a larger equity investment to the alliance. Given the cash demands of producers, need for flexibility in operations, and price sensitivity among producers and chefs, a low capital approach seems to be favored.

Given past experiences in Colorado and other regions of the US, an initial investment of $3-10,000 is needed to establish a alliance that focuses on hiring marketing personnel, but purchasing few assets. This investment could be gradually reduced until the market has matured enough that the 15% commission covers labor costs. Initial capital could come from producer investments, local or state grants targeting value-added agriculture or a combination of the two.

Sales and Financial Summary

At this point the investor must have a clear idea of where your business stands today. If you bore him or make the information he needs hard to find, you get canned. You must provide a snapshot, however sparse, of your financial position.

	2001	**2002** (forecast)
Sales:	$26,000 (including BAMCO)	$50,000
Gross profit:	$2,000	$7,500
Personnel Subsidy	$10,000	$5,000

A copy of the 2001 balance sheet and income statement is included in the appendix.

The Market

Given Carol Beaver's past experiences with marketing to restaurants, our marketing research and efforts were relatively focused on a couple of target suppliers and clients. In short, we decided to focus our efforts on independently owned restaurants, with a specific focus on members of culinary associations and the Chef's Collaborative (although all independent restaurants were sent surveys in Fort Collins since it was a small market). On the producer side, we narrowed our focus on those producers involved with existing farmer's markets since this would allow us to simplify half of the distribution system (as we could pick up at a central point, the farmer's market).

We began matching producers and restaurants through mail surveys. The very low response rate suggested we needed to try a different approach (the Chef's Collaborative mailing list was less helpful than we expected given that organization's strong support of local agriculture). For Boulder and Denver, Carol and her assistant used a broad faxing campaign to ascertain interest among chefs. They offered a weekly fax of available produce for those interested, and there was interest among about 12 restaurants. However, securing orders has been a challenge. For Fort Collins, we allied with the Foodlinks project to participate in a seminar they did with matching producers and chefs. We secured several good leads this way, and have grown the market through word-of-mouth, and personal visits to independent chefs with free produce samples to demonstrate the quality of local produce and gain their interest. In short, solicitation to chefs requires one-on-one visits, preferably with complementary product to showcase local producers and a product/price list to ascertain whether the project will fit their needs. In certain cases, we had the chefs visit market to get acquainted with the producers and their operations. We differentiated produce by "telling the producer's story" and noting the source of produce on invoices so that chefs could choose the exact type of produce or source of produce they wanted to buy (rather than selling the produce as a commodity).

On the producer side, there were similar challenges. It was difficult to motivate producers to see the value of the collaborative until we started securing orders and business for them. Thus, initial commitments were scarce. There are also some challenges in managing the project under the CAMC in Fort Collins because of dynamics that exist in that organization. In the future, we recommend that efforts be coordinated with a lead producer (or farmer's market manager) who already understands the dynamics of the producer-members, sees them frequently while at markets and understands the market season. This may also be more sustainable since this operation would augment their current direct marketing income, rather than be their sole reason to be actively involved in the markets.

A push marketing strategy was adopted for weekly operations. A comprehensive list of products, prices and seasons was used to establish marketing relationships with chefs, but orders can only be taken for in-season products. So, a product list was delivered to the chefs on a weekly basis, at the time of their previous week's delivery (or faxed if they did not take delivery in any one week). At the time of the call, the FCAMC representative also highlights the most unique, fresh produce and those items “coming into season” to ensure that chefs realize the diversity of produce available and raise awareness about the high seasons for specific lines of produce. This same approach was used for Boulder market (as it was adapted from Carol’s past success with such an approach).

Requests for products are taken by the FCAMC, and if current members are not able to supply all products, other local producers are contacted. This strategy was taken for two reasons; because we believe it would secure business with the restaurant if more of their local produce needs are met, and also, because we realize the need for a high volume of sales to cover the operational costs of running FCAMC in the future. This flexibility and integration of non-member producers could also be a tool for establishing long-term marketing relationships that can contribute to the viability of the program.

Finally, restaurants using the products from FCAMC may use the Colorado Cuisine Logo to identify the local nature of their ingredients and to add a “pull” to the marketing strategy. A small push was made to get chefs to participate, but this could be pursued far more aggressively in the off-season. We also plan to get chefs and the project featured in local media during the peak of the season (mid-late August).

Current weaknesses of this enterprise, and other markets, is that there is pressure to replicate the traditional food distribution system by being very “easy to use” for chefs. Although there are significant improvements to be made in managing the delivery and communication logistics of a farmer-chef marketing alliance, some challenges will persist by design. The most important factors here are the demand for unique, fresh produce. To meet the demand for 24-hour delivery and small volumes of unique produce, chefs need to be educated that some ordering delays (2 days ahead of delivery) and stock-outs will occur.

Customers

- ✓ *Get to know your chefs’ menus and your producers’ offerings. Each expects you to have a very good “sense of the market.”*
- ✓ *Offer to take chefs to market one day and introduce them to the producers*
- ✓ *Offer free samples if some types of products are not moving. I believe herbs were in high demand because we featured them in early sample baskets*
- ✓ *Establish standing orders when possible (for staple produce and herbs), and when making calls, have in your mind products you can recommend based on your perceptions of what they may find interesting. It is fairly easy to get each chef to add one additional product just by suggestion. Although none were willing to commit to standing orders initially, some chefs did finally arrive at standing orders after establishing a long-term view of marketing with producers.*
- ✓ *Be aware of chef’s peak times and avoid calling during these busy periods*
    - o *Call between 9:30 and 11 am for those restaurants that serve lunch (early in week)*
    - o *Deliver at the same times, or between 2 and 4 pm (to avoid meal time rushes)*

Pricing

Pricing is established from information gathered from local markets and producers. Some products are either used in such high volume or are available from so many sources that prices do not represent a premium on the conventional wholesale price. Producers are encouraged to provide these products if they are willing to take a less than premium price, but unique products that are unavailable through traditional marketing channels are kept at premium prices, even if chefs note some concern about price. Prices may vary throughout the season as products come into and out of season. FCAMC tried to keep firm prices as requested by producers, but individualized deals were made to keep restaurants satisfied and retain them as customers at the director's discretion.

There were several producers unsure of how to price their product, and restaurants were willing to share their current invoices in many cases, to help in that exercise. Further work could be done on establishing price points, especially for produce that is relatively unique and hard to find. If future conversations with chefs take place, I would strongly recommend that someone request their invoices for a month or week to look for other market opportunities and to develop a more educated pricing strategy.

A price and product list is included in the appendix as a reference and more detailed information is available from the author.

Exhibits

Observations from the 2001 market season:

In most cases, a $50 membership to FCAMC was collected. However, it was never actively used, but used as a tool to guarantee "producer buy-in" to the program. The only challenge was that we were often searching for product that our member base could not supply. So in some cases, produce was purchased from non-member producers. Although this led to concern among some, the overlying strategy was that members would always get first access to orders, and business with nonmembers would only occur in cases that members could not supply the full set of products or quantities ordered in a week. This problem should resolve itself as more producers see the value of membership. Again

In Boulder, the restaurants bore most of the cost of the operation, while in Fort Collins, those costs were born by producers. This detail was independently decided by Dawn and Carol based on their perceptions of what would work. In reality, who bears the costs should be irrelevant, as these costs can be built into the price sheets to restaurants. For instance, there were several producers who built the 15% into the prices they offered restaurants, and in most cases, the price was still attractive to the restaurants. This also made the project more attractive to chefs since they could easily compare food costs through the price list, with no concern about additional operational costs. This detail is something that may need to be customized to the market of interest though since it clearly reflects whether one believes it is more difficult to secure a commitment from the producers or chefs.

Capital Requirements and Financial Planning

- ✓ *Try to have one week's worth of orders in cash so most producers can be paid at the time of delivery. If this is not possible, make sure to begin leaving invoices with producers*
- ✓ *Keep good records….part of the headache we handle for restaurants is tracking many suppliers into one order, but that means the alliance manager must be careful to keep organized.*
  - *Spreadsheets should include a cash flow, balance sheet, producer-based ordering/payment sheet, and invoices for each restaurant/delivery day. Optimally, producers should all get invoices as wel,l even if paid in cash.*

Product List and Sample Invoice

Product	Units	Your Average Weekly Units	Price	Your Price	Season
Arugula (bunched)	24 ct		$25.30		(mid-May ** end-June) (Sept ** mid-C
(bulk)	1 lb		$4.25		(mid-May ** end-June) (Sept ** mid-C
Asparagus, green	lb		$1.85		(May ** mid-June)
Asparague, white	lb		$3.90		(May ** mid-June)
Basil	1 lb		$6.50		(Aug ******* end-Sept)
Beans, green	25 1b		$27.50		(mid-July ************ end-Sept)
Beans, yellow	10 lb		$15.75		(mid-July ************ end-Sept)
Beets, red (bulk)	25 lb		$15.60		(mid-July ** Winte
Bok Choy	20 lb		$7.50		(**June**) (Sept ***********
Brocolli, crown	20 lb		$15.00		(mid-June ****** end-July) (Sept *********
	14 ct		$14.00		
Cabbage, green	25 lb		$9.00		(mid-July *************************
Caggage, red	25 lb		$11.00		(mid-July ** Winte
Carrots, bulk	25 lb		$14.25		(mid-July ** Winte
Cauliflower	12 ct		$19.00		(mid-Sept ***
Celeriac	18 ct		$17.75		(Sept ***********
Cilantro	30 ct		$16.75		(June **
Corn, sweet	1 doz		$3.45		(mid-July ***** end-Aug)
Cucumbers, standard	20 1b		$8.00		(mid-July *********** mid-Sept)
Cucumbers, English	20 lb		$8.00		(mid-July *********** mid-Sept)
Dill	30 ct		$18.00		(July ****************************mid-C
Eggplant, regular	1 lb		$0.59		(Sept ******* end
	20 lb		$23.50		(Sept ******* end
Eggplant, Japanese	1 lb		$1.30		(Sept ******* end
Fennel	12 ct		$13.50		(July **********************end-Sept)

Greens, collards	*12 ct*		*$10.00*			*(mid-June* *************************************
Greens, green kale	*12 ct*		*$10.00*			*(mid-June* *************************************
Greens, mustard	*12 ct*		*$10.00*			*(mid-June* *************************************
Greens, red chard	*12 ct*		*$10.00*			*(mid-June* *************************************
Lettuce, batavia	*12 ct*		*$9.00*			*(June* ** *e*
Lettuce, bibb	*12 ct*		*$9.00*			*(June* ** *e*
Lettuce, crisp green	*12 ct*		*$9.00*			*(June* ** *e*
Lettuce, frisse	*12 ct*		*$9.00*			*(June* ** *e*
Lettuce, green leaf	*12 ct*		*$9.00*			*(June* ** *e*
Lettuce, ice queen	*12 ct*		*$9.00*			*(June* ** *e*
Lettuce, red leaf	*12 ct*		*$9.00*			*(June* ** *e*
Lettuce, romaine	*12 ct*		*$9.00*			*(June* ** *e*
Lettuce, salad mix	*3 lb*		*$17.00*			*(June* ** *e*
Leeks	*10 lb*		*$12.00*			*(mid-Aug* **************
Napa cabbage	*20 lb*		*$7.80*			*(Sept* *********************** *Winter)*
Onions, red	*20 lb*		*$11.70*			*(mid-Aug* **************
Onions, Spanish	*20 lb*		*$11.70*			*(mid-Aug* **************
Onions, Texas 1015	*20 lb*		*$11.70*			*(mid-Aug* **************
Onions, walla walla	*20 lb*		*$11.70*			*(Aug* *********************
Onions, white	*20 lb*		*$11.70*			*(mid-Aug* **************
Onions, yellow	*20 lb*		*$11.70*			*(mid-Aug* **************
Parsley, curly	*12 ct*		*$6.00*			*(July* ********************************* *en*
	30 ct		*$17.25*			*(July* ********************************* *en*
Parsley, Italian	*12 ct*		*$6.00*			*(July* ********************************* *en*
	30 ct		*$17.25*			*(July* ********************************* *en*
Peas, snow	*5 lb*		*$9.75*			*(mid-June* **** *end-July)*
Peas, sugarsnaps	*5 lb*		*$9.97*			*(mid-June* **** *end-July)*
Peppers, Anaheim	*1 lb*		*$1.63*			*(Aug* ********* *end-Sept)*
	5 lb		*$6.50*			*(Aug* ********* *end-Sept)*
Peppers, Hungarian	*1 lb*		*$2.60*			*(Aug* ********* *end-Sept)*
Peppers, green bell	*10 lb*		*$7.80*			*(Aug* ********* *end-Sept)*
	25 lb		*$18.20*			*(Aug* ********* *end-Sept)*
Peppers, red bell	*10 lb*		*$16.90*			*(Aug* ********* *end-Sept)*
	25 lb		*$33.00*			*(Aug* ********* *end-Sept)*
Potatoes, blue	*1 lb*		*$1.56*			*(Sept* *********************** *Winter)*
Potatoes, bison	*1 lb*		*$0.52*			*(Sept* *********************** *Winter)*
Potatoes, new french	*1 lb*		*$1.56*			*(Sept* *********************** *Winter)*
Potatoes, new rose	*1 lb*		*$1.56*			*(Sept* *********************** *Winter)*

Potatoes, new russian	*1 lb*		*$1.56*		*(Sept ************************ Winter)*
Potatoes, new yellow	*1 lb*		*$1.50*		*(Sept ************************ Winter)*
Potatoes, new red cl.	*1 lb*		*$1.25*		*(Sept ************************ Winter)*
Rutabaga	*20 lb*		*$8.80*		*(Oct **************** Winter)*
Scallions	*12 ct*		*$5.25*		*(July ******************************mid-(*
Radishes, red	*5 lb*		*$5.20*		*(mid-May * end-June)*
	12 ct		*$7.80*		*(mid-May * end-June)*
Radishes, french br.	*2 lb*		*$2.10*		*(mid-May * end-June)*
	24 ct		*$16.50*		*(mid-May * end-June)*
Radishes, winter	*25 lb*		*$16.00*		*(mid-Sept ***************** Winter)*
Shallots	*1 lb*		*$3.58*		*(Aug *************************
	5 lb		*$9.50*		
Spinach, washed leaf	*5 lb*		*$11.70*		*(June **** mid-July)*
	10 lb		*$20.00*		*(June **** mid-July)*
Spinach, baby, loose	*4 lb*		*$19.50*		*(June **** mid-July)*
Squash, acorn	*10 lb*		*$4.55*		*(mid-Sept ***************** Winter)*
Squash, buttercup	*10 lb*		*$4.55*		*(mid-Sept ***************** Winter)*
Squash, butternut	*10 lb*		*$4.55*		*(mid-Sept ***************** Winter)*
Squash, delicata	*10 lb*		*$4.55*		*(mid-Sept ***************** Winter)*
Squash, spaghetti	*10 lb*		*$4.55*		*(mid-Sept ***************** Winter)*
Squash, patti pan	*10 lb*		*$9.00*		*(mid-June ********************** mid-Sept)*
	20 lb		*$16.00*		*(mid-June ********************** mid-Sept)*
Squash, yellow	*10 lb*		*$9.00*		*(mid-June ********************** mid-Sept)*
	20 lb		*$16.90*		*(mid-June ********************** mid-Sept)*
Squash, zucchini	*20 lb*		*$16.90*		*(mid-June ********************** mid-Sept)*
Squash, zuch gold	*10 lb*		*$9.10*		*(mid-June ********************** mid-Sept)*
	20 lb		*$16.90*		*(mid-June ********************** mid-Sept)*
Tomatoes, red	*20 lb*		*$16.00*		*(Aug ********** end-Sept)*
Tomatoes, roma	*20 lb*		*$14.50*		*(Aug ********** end-Sept)*
Tomatoes, yell cherry	*5 lb*		*$6.00*		*(Aug ********** end-Sept)*
Tomatoes, yellow	*5 lb*		*$4.55*		*(Aug ********** end-Sept)*

2001 Balance Sheet

	Beginning	1-Oct
Assets		
Savings	*$250.00*	*$550.00*
Chef Checks	*-*	*$0.00*
Accounts Receivable	*$0.00*	*$0.00*
Cash	*$0.00*	*$1,131.00*
Prepaid Personnel	*$0.00*	*$2,000.00*
Total Assets	*$250.00*	*$3,681.00*
Liabilities		
Accounts Payable	*$0.00*	*$0.00*
Total Liabilities	*$0.00*	*$0.00*
Equity	*$250.00*	*$3,681.00*

2001 Income Statement

FCAMC Sales	$8,900
Less:	
Producer Payments	$7,600
Product Refunds	$ 180
Profit	$1,120

Note: All personnel, phone, mileage and some comp product were covered by the USDA-FSMIP grant for 2001.